

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA
NORTHWESTERN DIVISION**

Allen Christopher Epps,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER
)	
vs.)	
)	
Officer Erick Laudenschlager, et. al.,)	Case No. 4:14-cv-048
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff initiated the above-entitled action *pro se* on May 1, 2014, with the filing of a complaint and payment of the filing fee. Accompanying plaintiff's complaint (of which he submitted multiple copies) was a cover letter in which plaintiff stated, amongst other things, that it was his understanding that summonses "will be sent to each defendant by the court."

Insofar as plaintiff is requesting the Clerk's office to effectuate service on defendants, it is **DENIED**. Plaintiff has not sought leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. In an event, his payment of the filing fee suggests that he has the financial wherewithal to effectuate service. The court appreciates that plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*. Nevertheless, it incumbent upon him, not the Clerk's office, to serve each defendant with a summons and complaint in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4. The Clerk's office is directed to issue summonses to plaintiff and return to plaintiff the multiple copies of the complaint he has submitted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 5th day of May, 2014.

/s/ Charles S. Miller, Jr.
Charles S. Miller, Jr., Magistrate Judge
United States District Court